



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 September 2020

by Mr W Johnson BA(Hons) DipTP DipUDR MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/R5510/W/19/3243509

31 Drenon Square, Hayes UB3 2HQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Sukbir Sran against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Hillingdon.
 - The application Ref 4034/APP/2019/1259, dated 11 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 16 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as: '2-storey side & single storey rear extensions including COU to additional two-bedroom dwelling'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. Since the Council made its decision on the planning application, which is subject of this appeal, on 16 January 2020 the Hillingdon Local Plan: Part Two – Development Management Policies (2020) (LP2) was adopted. Consequently, the 'saved' policies contained within the Council's Unitary Development Plan have been superseded and the Supplementary Planning Document HDAS: Residential Extensions and Residential Layouts have been withdrawn. I am required to determine this appeal on the basis of the development plan which is in force at the time of my decision.
3. The Council have provided copies of LP2 Policies DMHB 11, DMHB 12 and DMHB 18 that it now relies upon, in addition to those cited from the Council's Local Plan: Part One – Strategic Policies 2012 (LP1) and The London Plan 2016 (LonP). As these have been provided with the Questionnaire, I will not prejudice any party in taking these policies into account in the determination of this appeal. I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.

Main Issues

4. The main issues of this appeal are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - i. the character and appearance of the appeal site and surrounding area; and,
 - ii. the living conditions of future occupiers.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached house occupying a corner plot location. The residential properties are situated around Drenon Square on both

sides of the narrow carriageway, where a one-way system is in operation. The appeal property is rendered with a tiled roof. No 31 has a double frontage with a door located centrally and whilst there are subtle differences between the other properties on Drenon Square, they are generally similar in form and appearance. The appeal site comprises a corner site, which is larger than most of the plots situated around Drenon Square, although a similar sized plot at No 25 Drenon Square is in proximity of the site.

6. The proposed development comprises a 2-storey side extension and a part single/part 2-storey rear extension that would wrap around the existing house. The single storey rear extension would serve the existing house, whilst the 2-storey side and 2-storey rear extension would provide the accommodation for the new dwelling. The appeal scheme would provide a significant amount of additional accommodation when compared with the original property.
7. I observed the return building line created by No's 45 and 47 Drenon Square, which in the context of the surrounding area, I find to form an important characteristic in the street scene. The proposed development would breach the return building line through its width, which would in turn create an awkward and strident feature in the street scene. This feature would be accentuated through the overall bulk and massing of the 2-storey side/rear extension containing the new residential unit and the presence of a hipped roof over the 2-storey rear projection. These factors would diminish and unbalance the character and appearance of the host dwelling to the detriment of the wider street scene.
8. Additionally, the proposed development would create a small terrace of houses in an area where the street scene is strongly characterised by semi-detached houses. This forms a strong and positive characteristic in the street scene. Whilst other properties in the vicinity of the site have larger areas of hardstanding for parking vehicles, I find that in combination with the other elements of the scheme, the proposed areas for parking vehicles in the proposed development would further detract from the existing character and appearance of the appeal site and surrounding area. Although the appeal site benefits from a larger irregular corner plot location, this would not provide sufficient mitigation to overcome the harmful visual effects of the proposed development.
9. For all of these reasons, I therefore conclude that the proposed development would significantly harm the character and appearance of the appeal site and surrounding area. This would be contrary to the design, character and appearance aims of LP1 Policy BE1, LP2 Policies DMHB 11 and DMHB 12 and LonP Policies 3.5 and 7.4. The proposal would also be contrary to the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Living conditions

10. Concerns have been raised in relation to the size of the dwelling, which is understood to consist of approximately 67m² of gross internal floor space, which is not disputed by the appellant. I have examined the details before me in the statement from the appellant and on the application plans it confirms that the proposal is for a 3no. person, 2no. bedroom property. Under these circumstances and in the absence of any substantive information to the contrary, I have no reason to doubt that the proposed house is for 3 people with 2 bedrooms. Therefore, in referring to the Technical housing standards –

nationally described space standard, March 2015 (THS), a 2no. bedroom dwelling for 3 people over two-storeys requires 70m² of internal floor area with no built in storage. The appeal scheme does not meet this minimum requirement.

11. It is common ground between the main parties that the outdoor amenity space to serve both properties would be adequate. However, concerns have been raised in relation to the level of privacy that would be afforded by future occupants due to the prominent and exposed location of the site. In this regard I note a number of trees are present and a mature hedge on the boundary with the road. Nonetheless, I do not find these features would provide sufficient mitigation to prevent any meaningful loss of privacy, especially to the occupiers of the new dwelling. I consider the proposed dwelling would not provide an adequate level of accommodation for future occupiers. This does not weigh in favour of the proposal. Consequently, given my findings on the details before me, I do not consider that otherwise unacceptable development could be made acceptable through the use of planning conditions in this instance.
12. For all of these reasons, I therefore conclude that the proposed development would significantly harm the living conditions of future occupiers. This would be contrary to the amenity aims of LP2 Policy DMHB 18, LonP Policy 3.5 (including Table 3.3), LonP Supplementary Planning Guidance – Housing 2016 and guidance contained in the THS. The proposal would also be contrary to the requirements of the Framework.

Other Matter

13. The appellant has brought to my attention other properties¹ in the locality of the site, but no details have been provided regarding the particular planning background to those schemes. Without such information a detailed comparison between those schemes and the case before me cannot be drawn except insofar as I was able to observe and assess the sites at my visit. I have considered this appeal proposal on its own particular merits and concluded that it would cause harm for the reasons set out above.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

14. Whilst I accept the absence of other harm arising from the scheme and the social and economic benefits derived from the construction of an additional dwelling, its subsequent occupation and the modest contribution to the Council's housing supply, amongst other things, these factors, for the reasons described, do not outweigh my assessment of the main issues. This would conflict with parts of the environmental and social objectives set out in paragraph 8 of the Framework. Thus, the proposal does not constitute sustainable development.
15. Taking all matters into consideration, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

W Johnson

INSPECTOR

¹ No 164 North Hyde Road, Hayes, UB3 4NH and No 52 Longmead Road, Hayes, UB3 2HD